

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 200
Boston, MA 02114
(617) 979-1900

TIANNA TAYLOR-ROSENEY,
Appellant

v.

BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Respondent

Docket Number:	G1-25-045
Appearance for Appellant:	<i>Pro Se</i> Tianna Taylor-Roseney
Appearance for Respondent:	Joseph McClellan, Esq. Boston Police Department Office of the Legal Advisor One Schroeder Plaza Boston, MA 02120
Commissioner:	Christopher C. Bowman

SUMMARY OF ORDER

The Commission dismissed the bypass appeal of a candidate for Boston police officer as the candidate was bypassed for the same reason in a prior hiring cycle and the Commission recently issued a decision affirming that bypass.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Procedural Background

On February 13, 2025, the Appellant, Tianna Taylor-Roseney (Appellant), filed a bypass appeal with the Civil Service Commission (Commission), contesting the decision of the Boston Police Department (BPD) to bypass her for original appointment as a police officer. On February 21, 2025, the BPD notified the Commission that it would be seeking to have the appeal

dismissed. On April 15, 2025, I held a pre-hearing conference, at which time the BPD's request was considered, that was attended by the Appellant and counsel for the BPD.

Undisputed Facts

Based on the statements of the parties and the written submissions, the following is undisputed:

1. The Appellant filed *prior* bypass appeals with the Commission, contesting the decision of the BPD to bypass her for appointment. Most relevant to this appeal is the most recent prior appeal docketed under G1-24-081.
2. In a [decision dated January 23, 2025](#), the Commission upheld the BPD's decision to bypass the Appellant "based on the [Appellant]'s poor judgment related to a recent incident which resulted in criminal charges against her." The Appellant has sought judicial review of that Commission decision. (Taylor-Roseney v. Civil Service Commission and Boston Police Department, Suffolk Super. Ct. No. 2584CV00416)
3. On January 13, 2025, as part of a subsequent hiring cycle, the BPD notified the Appellant that she was again being bypassed for appointment for the same reason.
4. On February 13, 2025, the Appellant filed the instant appeal, under Docket Number G1-25-045.

STANDARD FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION

The Commission may, on motion or upon its own initiative, dismiss an appeal at any time for lack of jurisdiction or for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. 801 CMR 1.01(7)(g)(3). A motion before the Commission, in whole or in part, via summary decision may be filed pursuant to 801 C.M.R. 1.01(7)(h). An appeal may be decided on summary disposition only when, "viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party", the

undisputed material facts affirmatively demonstrate that the non-moving party has “no reasonable expectation” of prevailing on at least one “essential element of the case”. See, e.g., *Milliken & Co. v. Duro Textiles LLC*, 451 Mass. 547, 550 n.6 (2008); *Maimonides School v. Coles*, 71 Mass. App. Ct. 240, 249 (2008); *Lydon v. Massachusetts Parole Bd.*, 18 MCSR 216 (2005). See also *Mangino v. HRD*, 27 MCSR 34 (2014) and cases cited (“The notion underlying the summary decision process in administrative proceedings parallels the civil practice under Mass. R. Civ. P. 56, namely, when no genuine issues of material fact exist, the agency is not required to conduct a meaningless hearing.”); *Morehouse v. Weymouth Fire Dep’t*, 26 MCSR 176 (2013) (“a party may move for summary decision when . . . there is no genuine issue of fact relating to his or her claim or defense and the party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law.”)

ANALYSIS

Here, the parties agree that the bypass reason for this most recent hiring cycle currently before the Commission is the same as that contained in the prior bypass referenced above. Given that the Commission has already affirmed the Appellant’s prior bypass based on the same reason relied upon in a prior hiring cycle, there are no factual disputes which would warrant a new evidentiary hearing. Put another way, there is no additional information that could be presented that would change the Commission’s decision regarding the validity of the bypass reason, reached by the Commission only weeks ago. See *Lima v. City of New Bedford*, 33 MCSR 285 (2020) and *Reynolds v. City of Brockton*, 37 MCSR 37 (2024) (Commission dismissed subsequent bypass appeal as it had upheld same reasons in prior bypass decided by Commission months earlier).

CONCLUSION

For the above reason, the Appellant's appeal under Docket Number G1-25-045 is hereby *dismissed*.

Civil Service Commission

/s/ Christopher Bowman
Christopher C. Bowman
Chair

By a vote of the Civil Service Commission (Bowman, Chair; Dooley, Markey and Stein, Commissioners [McConney – Absent]) on May 1, 2025.

Either party may file a motion for reconsideration within ten days of the receipt of this Commission order or decision. Under the pertinent provisions of the Code of Mass. Regulations, 801 CMR 1.01(7)(l), the motion must identify a clerical or mechanical error in this order or decision or a significant factor the Agency or the Presiding Officer may have overlooked in deciding the case. A motion for reconsideration does not toll the statutorily prescribed thirty-day time limit for seeking judicial review of this Commission order or decision.

Under the provisions of G.L. c. 31, § 44, any party aggrieved by this Commission order or decision may initiate proceedings for judicial review under G.L. c. 30A, § 14 in the superior court within thirty (30) days after receipt of this order or decision. Commencement of such proceeding shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of this Commission order or decision. After initiating proceedings for judicial review in Superior Court, the plaintiff, or his / her attorney, is required to serve a copy of the summons and complaint upon the Boston office of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth, with a copy to the Civil Service Commission, in the time and in the manner prescribed by Mass. R. Civ. P. 4(d)

Notice to:

Tianna Taylor-Roseney (Appellant)
Joseph McClellan, Esq. (for Respondent)